arXiv:1609.00290v1 [math.CO] 1 Sep 2016

COUNTING STRONGLY CONNECTED (k_1, k_2)-DIRECTED CORES

BORIS PITTEL

Abstract. Consider the set of all digraphs on $[N]$ with M edges, whose minimum in-degree and minimum out-degree are at least k_1 and k_2 respectively. For $k := \min\{k_1, k_2\} \geq 2$ and $M/N \geq \max\{k_1, k_2\} + \varepsilon$, $M = \Theta(N)$, we show that, among those digraphs, the fraction of k-strongly connected digraphs is $1 - O\big(N^{-(k-1)}\big)$. Earlier with Dan Poole we identified a sharp edge-density threshold $c^*(k_1, k_2)$ for birth of a giant (k_1, k_2)-core in the random digraph $D(n, m = [cn])$. Combining the claims, for $c > c^*(k_1, k_2)$ with probability $1 - O\big(N^{-(k-1)}\big)$ the giant (k_1, k_2)-core exists and is k-strongly connected.

1. Results and related work

Let the fixed integers $k_1 \geq 2$, $k_2 \geq 2$ be given. A digraph is called a directed (k_1, k_2)-core (dicore) if its minimum in-degree and minimum out-degree are, at least, k_1 and k_2 respectively.

Theorem 1.1. *Let M, N be such that $M \geq (\max\{k_1, k_2\} + \varepsilon)N$, and $M = O(N)$. For $\mathbf{k} := (k_1, k_2)$, let $D_{\mathbf{k}}(N, M)$ be a dicore chosen uniformly at random among all simple dicores with N vertices and M directed eges. Then, denoting $k = \min\{k_1, k_2\}$, $D_{\mathbf{k}}(N, M)$ is strongly connected with probability $1 - O(N^{-2(k-1)})$, and k-strongly connected with probability $1 - O(N^{-(k-1)})$.*

This theorem leads to a sharp asymptotic formula for $C_{\mathbf{k}}(N, M)$, the total number of k-strongly connected dicores on $[N]$ with M edges. Given $z > 0$, let $\mathrm{Poi}(z|k)$ stand for the $\mathrm{Poisson}(z)$ conditioned on $\{\mathrm{Poisson}(z) \geq k\}$. Introduce

$$p_k(z) = \mathrm{P}\big(\mathrm{Poisson}(z) \geq k\big), \quad f_k(z) = e^z p_k(z) = \sum_{j \geq k} \frac{z^j}{j!}.$$

Date: September 2, 2016.
1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C30; 05C80; 05C05; 34E05; 60C05.
Key words and phrases. digraph, counting cores, strong connectivity.

Corollary 1.2. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1,*

$$C_{\mathbf{k}}(N,M)=\big(1+O(N^{-1}\log^6 N)\big)\exp\left(-\frac{M}{N}-\frac12\prod_{j=1}^{2}E\big[Poi(z_j|k_j-1)\big]\right)$$
$$\times M!\prod_{j=1}^{2}\frac{f_{k_j}(z_j)^N}{z_j^M\sqrt{2\pi N\,Var(Poi(z_j|k_j))}},$$

where z_1, z_2 satisfy $E\big[Poi(z_j|k_j)\big]=\frac{M}{N}$.

The RHS expression is also an asymptotic formula for $D_{\mathbf{k}}(N,M)$ the total number of all (k_1,k_2)-dicores, whose proof is a carbon copy of the formula (2.10) in Pittel [12] for the special case $k_1=k_2=1$. (Without convergence rate, but under less restrictive condition on $M=M(N)$, that formula for $D_{\mathbf{k}}(N,M)$ had been proved by Pérez-Giménez and Wormald [11].) So Corollary 1.2 follows from

$$C_{\mathbf{k}}(N,M)/D_{\mathbf{k}}(N,M)=1-O\big(N^{-(k-1)}\big),$$

a rephrased version of Theorem 1.1. To compare, it was proved in [12] that, for $M-N\gg N^{2/3}$, $M=O(N)$,

$$\mathcal{C}_{1,1}(N,M)=\big(1+O(N^2/(M-N)^3+N^{-1}\log^6 N)\big)\exp\left(-\frac{M}{N}-\frac{z^2}{2}\right)$$
$$\times\frac{M!}{2\pi N\mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{Poi}(z|1))}\frac{f_1(z)^{2N}}{z^{2M}}\cdot\frac{\big(1-\frac{z}{f_1(z)}\big)^2}{1-\frac{z}{e^z f_1(z)}}\ \exp\left[\frac{z}{f_1(z)}(2-e^{-z})\right],$$

where z satisfies $\mathrm{E}\big[\mathrm{Poi}(z|1)\big]=\frac{M}{N}$. See [11] for a version of the last formula, under broader conditions $M-N\to\infty$, $M=O(N\log N)$ but without convergence rates.

It has long been known that, for the uniformly random digraph $D(n,m)$ with n vertices and m edges $[n]$, the edge density $m/n=1$ is the sharp threshold for birth of a giant strong component, see Karp [4] and T. Łuczak [7], and a more recent paper by T. Łuczak and Seierstad [8]. And in Pittel and Poole [13] it was proved that for the postcritical stage $m/n>1$ the number of vertices and the number of edges in the strong giant have a joint Gaussian distribution in the limit $n\to\infty$. This can be viewed as a directed analogue of the earlier result, Pittel and Wormald [16], on the limit Gaussian distribution of the number of vertices and the number of edges in the 2-core, and the number of vertices in the "forrest" mantle, of the giant component in the postcritical Erdős-Rényi random graph $G(n,m=[cn])$. Pittel, Spencer and Wormald [15] determined the edge density threshold $c^*(k)$ for birth of a giant k-core ($k\ge3$) in $G(n,m=[cn])$:

$$c^*(k)=\min_{z>0}\frac{z}{p_{k-1}(z)}.$$

Recently an analogous result for $D(n, m = [cn])$ was proved in Pittel and Poole [14]. Let

$$c^* = c^*(\mathbf{k}) := \min_{z_1,z_2>0} \max\left\{\frac{z_1}{p_{k_1}(z_1)p_{k_2-1}(z_2)}; \frac{z_2}{p_{k_1-1}(z_1)p_{k_2}(z_2)}\right\}.$$

Theorem 1.3. *([14]) Let k_1, $k_2 \geq 0$, $\max\{k_1, k_2\} \geq 2$. Then*

- *for $c < c^*$, quite surely (q.s.) the (k_1, k_2)-core of $D(n, m = [cn])$ is empty;*
- *for $c > c^*$, q.s. the (k_1, k_2)-core of $D(n, m = [cn])$ is not empty; in fact, there are some $\alpha(c) = \alpha(\mathbf{k}, c)$ and $\beta(c) = \beta(\mathbf{k}, c)$, with $\alpha(c) > \max\{k_1, k_2\}\beta(c)$, such that q.s. the (k_1, k_2)-core has $\beta(c)n + O(n^{1/2}\log n)$ vertices and $\alpha(c)n + O(n^{1/2}\log n)$ edges.*

Here "quite surely" means that the event in question has probability $1-O(n^{-K})$, for all $K > 0$. Our study left open an issue of strong connectivity of the giant (k_1, k_2)-core for $c > c^*$. Many years ago T. Łuczak [6] proved that, for $k \geq 3$, w.h.p. if a k-core is present in $G(n, m)$ it must be k-connected. Dan Poole has conjectured that likewise, for $k = \min\{k_1, k_2\} \geq 2$ and $c > c^*(\mathbf{k})$, w.h.p. the giant (k_1, k_2)-core of $D(n, m = [cn])$ is k-strongly connected. The theorem 1.1 can be used to confirm Dan's conjecture. Here is how.

The proof of Theorem 1.3 in [14] was based on analysis of a deletion algorithm: at each step a uniformly random vertex, with either light in-degree, i.e. below k_1, or light out-degree, i.e. below k_2, is deleted, together with all incident edges. Instead of $D(n, m = [cn])$, we considered a uniformly random multi-digraph $\mathcal{D}(n, m = [cn])$, multiple loops and multiple edges allowed, on n vertices with m *labeled* edges. Conditioned on being simple, $\mathcal{D}(n, m = [cn])$ is distributed as $D(n, m = [cn])$. For $m = O(n)$, $\mathcal{D}(n, m = [cn])$ is simple with positive asymptotic probability $e^{-c-c^2/2}$. Thus an event unlikely for $\mathcal{D}(n, m = [cn])$ is *equally* unlikely for $D(n, m = [cn])$. It is convenient to view $\mathcal{D}(n, m = [cn])$ as a directed version of a sequence model invented by Chvátal [2] for study of 3-colorability of $G(n, m)$, $m = O(n)$, and later used by Aronson, Frieze and Pittel [1] for analysis of a vertex deletion process at the heart of the Karp-Sipser greedy matching algorithm [5].

Let us reproduce the definition of the sequence model from [14], since it will be instrumental in our proofs in this paper as well. Given a sequence $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{2m})$, $x_i \in [n]$, we define a *multi*-digraph $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{x}}$ with vertex set $[n]$ and (directed) edge set $\big[\{x_{2r-1}, x_{2r}\} : 1 \leq r \leq m\big]$; thus $e_{\mathbf{x}}(i, j)$, the number of directed edges $i \to j$, is $|\{r : x_{2r-1} = i, x_{2r} = j\}$. The in-degree sequence $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and the out-degree sequence $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\mathbf{x}}$ of $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{x}}$ are given by $\delta_{\mathbf{x}}(i) = |\{r : x_{2r} = i\}|$, $\Delta_{\mathbf{x}}(i) = |\{r : x_{2r-1} = i\}|$, so that $\sum_{I\in[n]} \delta_{\mathbf{x}}(i) = \sum_{I\in[n]} \Delta_{\mathbf{x}}(i) = m$. If $\mathbf{x}$ is distributed uniformly on the set $[n]^{2m}$ then $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\mathcal{D}(n, m)$ are equi-distributed. Consequently $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{\mathbf{x}}$ are mutually independent, each

distributed multinomially, with m trials and n equally likely outcomes in each trial.

The deletion algorithm delivers a sequence $\{\mathbf{x}(t)\}$ where $\mathbf{x}(0)=\mathbf{x}$, and each $\mathbf{x}(t)\in([n]\cup\{\star\})^{2m}$, where for all r, $x_{2r-1}(t)=\star$ if and only if $x_{2r}(t)=\star$. The $(\star,\star)$ pairs mark the locations $(2r-1,2r)$ in the original $\mathbf{x}(0)$ whose vertex occupants have been deleted after t steps. The process $\{\mathbf{x}(t)\}$ is obviously Markov, though the complexity of its sample space makes it intractable. Let $\mathbf{s}_{\mathbf{x}}$ be a $[(k_1+1)(k_2+1)+1]$-tuple whose components are the counts of vertices that are in/out-light, in-light/out-heavy, in-heavy/out-light, in-heavy/out-heavy, and the total count of all edges in $\mathbf{x}$. We need that many components since, to preserve Markovian property, we have to classify the in-light degrees and the out-light degrees according to their possible k_1 and k_2 values. Fortunately no similar classification is needed for the in-heavy degrees and the out-heavy degrees. It was proved in [14] that the process $\{\mathbf{s}(t)\}:=\{s_{\mathbf{x}(t)}\}$ is indeed Markov, and that, conditioned on $\mathbf{s}(t)$, the sequence $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is uniform.

The upshot of this discussion is that, conditioned on the terminal vertex set and the terminal number of edges, the terminal sequence $\mathbf{x}$ is distributed uniformly. So Theorem 1.1 in combination with Theorem 1.3 from [14] yield

Corollary 1.4. *Let $k_1\ge 2$, $k_2\ge 2$. If $c>c^*(\mathbf{k})$ then with probability $1-O\big(n^{-\min\{k_1,k_2\}+1}\big)$ the random digraph $D(n,m=[cn])$ has a giant (k_1,k_2)-core which is $\min\{k_1,k_2\}$-strongly connected.*

It is edge sparseness of the near-postcritical $D(n,m)$, i.e. m being of order n, that forces us to push the in/out degrees minimally upward from 1. Pérez-Giménez and Wormald [11] proved that, when $m/n\to\infty$, the random digraph, whose all in/out degrees are merely positive, is strongly connected with high probability.

Cooper and Frieze [3] studied a random directed graph with a *given* degree sequence, which is a counterpart of the random undirected graph first introduced and analyzed by Molloy and Reed [9], [10]. Among other results, it was proven in [3] that for a "proper" in/out *positive* degree sequence the random digraph has a giant strongly-connected component comprised of almost all vertices.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.1

To analyze strong connectedness of $D_{\mathbf{k}}(N,M)$, we use the Chvátal-type sequence model. Each admissible sequence $\mathbf{x}$ is obtained by filling the M pairs of consecutive locations $(2r-1,2r)$, $r\in[M]$, with the vertices from $[N]$ such that every vertex appears at least k_2 times in the odd-numbered locations and at least k_1 times in the even-numbered locations. Let $\boldsymbol{\delta}$, $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ denote the in/out vertex degrees of an admissible sequence. Then

$$\delta_i\ge k_1,\ \Delta_i\ge k_2;\quad \sum_{i\in[N]}\delta_i=\sum_{i\in[N]}\Delta_i=M. \tag{2.1}$$

As in [14], the total number $S_{N,M}$ of these sequences is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S_{N,M} &= \sum_{\boldsymbol{\delta},\boldsymbol{\Delta} \text{ meet (2.1)}} \frac{(M!)^2}{\prod\limits_{i\in[N]} \delta_i!\,\Delta_i!} \\ &= (M!)^2 [z_i^M z_o^M] f_{k_1}(z_i)^N\, f_{k_2}(z_o)^N \\ &= \Omega\left(N^{-1} (M!)^2 \frac{f_{k_1}(z_i)^N\, f_{k_2}(z_o)^N}{z_i^M\, z_o^M} \right); \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

here z_i and z_o are the roots of

$$\frac{z_i\, f_{k_1-1}(z_i)}{f_{k_1}(z_i)} = \frac{M}{N}, \quad \frac{z_o f_{k_2-1}(z_o)}{f_{k_2}(z_o)} = \frac{M}{N}. \tag{2.3}$$

The subindices "i" and "o" stand for "in" and "out" respectively. The conditions (2.3) mean that z_i and z_o are the absolute minimum points for the functions $z^{-M} f_{k_1}(z)^N$ and $z^{-M} f_{k_2}(z)^N$ respectively

We need to show that w.h.p. the uniformly random sequence is such that the corresponding digraph is $k := \min\{k_1, k_2\}$-strongly connected. To this end, we have to show that the number of sequences $\mathbf{x}$, such that deletion of a set T of $t < k$ vertices results in partition of $[N] \setminus T$ into the disjoint union of a source/sink set A and a sink/source set $B = ([N] \setminus T) \setminus A$, is $o(S_{N,M})$ as $N \to \infty$. It suffices to consider the case when $|A| \le (N-t)/2$. Since we are interested in the sequences that can be induced by a *simple* (k_1, k_2)-core, thus with each vertex of in-degree k_1 and out-degree k_2 at least, we may and will focus on $|A| \ge 2$.

For certainty, let A be a source set. Let us consider $t = 0$ first. Let $\nu \in [2, N/2]$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \mu_{1,2}, \mu_2)$, $\mu_1 + \mu_{1,2} + \mu_2 = M$. Let $S_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ be the total number of the sequences x that contain a source set A of cardinality ν, such that μ_1 (μ_2 resp.) is the number of edges between the vertices in A (in B resp.), and $\mu_{1,2}$ is the number of edges from vertices in A to vertices in B. It is necessary, of course, that

$$\mu_1 \ge k_1\nu,\ \mu_1 + \mu_{1,2} \ge k_2\nu,\ \mu_{1,2} + \mu_2 \ge k_1(N-\nu),\ \mu_2 \ge k_2(N-\nu). \tag{2.4}$$

To be sure, the sequences $\mathbf{x}$ that contain several such source sets A will be counted more than once.

By symmetry,

$$S_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \binom{N}{\nu} \binom{M}{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \mathcal{S}_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}}; \tag{2.5}$$

here $\mathcal{S}_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is the total number of special admissible sequences with parameters ν and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$. For an admissible sequence to be special, the first μ_1 ordered pairs must be formed by vertices from $[\nu]$, the next $\mu_{1,2}$ pairs–by pairs of vertices, left from $[\nu]$, right from $[N-\nu] := (\nu+1, \dots, N)$, and the last μ_2 pairs–by vertices from $[N-\nu]$. Further, for the first block and $i \in [\nu]$, let $\delta_i^{(1)}$, ($\Delta_i^{(1)}$ resp.) denote the number of pairs containing i in the right slot (the left slot resp.); for the second block and for $i \in [\nu]$, let $\Delta_i^{(1,2)}$ denote the number of

the left slots containing i, and for $i \in [N-\nu]$, let $\delta_i^{(1,2)}$, denote the number of right slots containing i; for the third block and $i \in [N-\nu]$, let $\delta_i^{(2)}$, ($\Delta_i^{(2)}$ resp.) denote the number of pairs containing i in the right slot (the left slot resp.). Then necessarily

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_i^{(1)} \ge k_1,\ \Delta_i^{(1)} + \Delta_i^{(1,2)} \ge k_2, \quad i \in [\nu], \\ \delta_i^{(1,2)} + \delta_i^{(2)} \ge k_1,\ \Delta_i^{(2)} \ge k_2, \quad i \in [N-\nu], \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i\in[\nu]} \delta_i^{(1)} = \sum_{i\in[\nu]} \Delta_i^{(1)} = \mu_1, \\ \sum_{i\in[N-\nu]} \delta_i^{(1,2)} = \sum_{i\in[\nu]} \Delta_i^{(1,2)} = \mu_{1,2}, \\ \sum_{i\in[N-\nu]} \delta_i^{(2)} = \sum_{i\in[N-\nu]} \Delta_i^{(2)} = \mu_2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

Enter the generating functions. Introduce the indeterminates $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_{1,2}, x_2)$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_{1,2}, y_2)$, and the notations $\boldsymbol{\mu}! = \mu_1!\mu_{1,2}!\mu_2!$, $\mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = x_1^{\mu_1} x_{1,2}^{\mu_{1,2}} x_2^{\mu_2}$, $\mathbf{y}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = y_1^{\mu_1} y_{1,2}^{\mu_{1,2}} y_2^{\mu_2}$, and $x = x_{1,2} + x_2$, $y = y_1 + y_{1,2}$. Using

$$\sum_{d_1+\cdots+d_r\ge k} \prod_{j=1}^{r} \frac{\xi_j^{d_j}}{d_j!} = f_k\left(\sum_{j=1}^{r} \xi_j\right),$$

we write

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \sum_{\substack{(\boldsymbol{\delta},\boldsymbol{\Delta}) \text{ meet} \\ (2.6),(2.7)}} & \frac{(\mu_1!)^2}{\prod_{i\in[\nu]} (\delta_i^{(1)})! \cdot (\Delta_i^{(1)})!} \\ & \times \frac{(\mu_{1,2}!)^2}{\prod_{i\in[\nu],\, j\in[N-\nu]} (\Delta_i^{(1,2)})! \cdot (\delta_j^{(1,2)})!} \cdot \frac{(\mu_2!)^2}{\prod_{i\in[N-\nu]} (\delta_i^{(2)})! \cdot (\Delta_i^{(2)})!} \\ & = (\boldsymbol{\mu}!)^2 \left[\mathbf{x}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \mathbf{y}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\right] \left(\sum_{\delta\ge k_1} \frac{x_1^{\delta}}{\delta!}\right)^{\nu} \cdot \left(\sum_{\Delta\ge k_2} \frac{y_2^{\Delta}}{\Delta!}\right)^{N-\nu} \\ \times & \left(\sum_{\Delta^{(1)}+\Delta^{(2)}\ge k_2} \frac{y_1^{\Delta^{(1)}} y_{1,2}^{\Delta^{(1,2)}}}{\Delta^{(1)}!\,\Delta^{(1,2)}!}\right)^{\nu} \cdot \left(\sum_{\delta^{(1,2)}+\delta^{(2)}\ge k_1} \frac{x_{1,2}^{\delta^{(1,2)}} x_2^{\delta^{(2)}}}{\delta^{(1,2}!\delta^{(2)}!}\right)^{N-\nu} \\ & = (\boldsymbol{\mu}!)^2 [x_1^{\mu_1}] f_{k_1}(x_1)^{\nu}\, [y_2^{\mu_2}] f_{k_2}(y_2)^{N-\nu} \\ & \qquad \times [y_1^{\mu_1} y_{1,2}^{\mu_{1,2}}] f_{k_2}(y)^{\nu}\, [x_{1,2}^{\mu_{1,2}} x_2^{\mu_2}] f_{k_1}(x)^{N-\nu}; \end{aligned}$$

here

$$[y_1^{\mu_1} y_{1,2}^{\mu_{1,2}}] f_{k_2}(y)^\nu = \binom{\mu_1+\mu_{1,2}}{\mu_1} [y^{\mu_1+\mu_{1,2}}] f_{k_2}(y)^\nu,$$
$$[x_{1,2}^{\mu_{1,2}} x_2^{\mu_2}] f_{k_1}(x)^{N-\nu} = \binom{\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2}{\mu_2} [x^{\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2}] f_{k_1}(x)^{N-\nu}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \mu_1!\mu_2!(\mu_1+\mu_{1,2})!(\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2)! \\ \times [x_1^{\mu_1}] f_{k_1}(x_1)^\nu \, [y_2^{\mu_2}] f_{k_2}(y_2)^{N-\nu} \\ \times [y^{\mu_1+\mu_{1,2}}] f_{k_2}(y)^\nu \, [x^{\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2}] f_{k_1}(x)^{N-\nu}. \quad (2.8)\end{aligned}$$

So, by (2.5),

$$\begin{aligned}S_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}} = M! \binom{N}{\nu} \cdot \frac{(\mu_1+\mu_{1,2})!(\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2)!}{\mu_{1,2}!} \\ \times [x_1^{\mu_1}] f_{k_1}(x_1)^\nu \, [y_2^{\mu_2}] f_{k_2}(y_2)^{N-\nu} \\ \times [y^{\mu_1+\mu_{1,2}}] f_{k_2}(y)^\nu \, [x^{\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2}] f_{k_1}(x)^{N-\nu}. \quad (2.9)\end{aligned}$$

To bound $S_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, we need an inequality

$$[x^a] f_k(x)^b \le \frac{\gamma_k}{\sqrt{bx}} \frac{f_k(x)^b}{x^a}, \quad \forall\, x > 0, \tag{2.10}$$

where γ_k depends on k only. The proof follows from the Cauchy integral formula

$$[x^a] f_k(x)^b = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_{|z|=x} \frac{f_k(z)^b}{z^{a+1}}\, dz,$$

and an inequality

$$|f_k(xe^{i\theta})| \le f_k(x) \exp\left(x \frac{\cos\theta - 1}{k+1}\right), \quad (x > 0),$$

see [12]. In addition, $f_k(x)$ is log-concave for $x > 0$ since

$$(\log f_k(x))' = \frac{f_{k-1}(x)}{f_k(x)} = 1 + \left(\sum_{j\ge k} \frac{(k-1)!}{j!} x^{j-k+1}\right)^{-1}$$

decreases with x.

Using (2.10) and log-concavity of f_k, we have

$$\begin{aligned}[x_1^{\mu_1}] f_{k_1}(x_1)^\nu \, [x^{\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2}] f_{k_1}(x)^{N-\nu} &\le \frac{\gamma_{k_1}^2}{\sqrt{\nu x_1 (N-\nu) x}} \frac{f_{k_1}(x_1)^\nu}{x_1^{\mu_1}} \frac{f_{k_1}(x)^{N-\nu}}{x^{\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2}} \\ &\le \frac{\gamma_{k_1}^2}{\sqrt{\nu x_1 (N-\nu) x}} \frac{f_{k_1}\left(\frac{\nu}{N} x_1 + \frac{N-\nu}{N} x\right)^N}{x_1^{\mu_1}\, x^{\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2}},\end{aligned}$$

for all $x_1 > 0$, $x > 0$. By $\mu_1 + \mu_{1,2} + \mu_2 = M$ and (2.3), we easily obtain that the last fraction attains its minimum at

$$x_1 = \frac{Nz_i}{M} \cdot \frac{\mu_1}{\nu}, \quad x = \frac{Nz_i}{M} \cdot \frac{\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2}{N-\nu},$$

and the minimum itself is

$$\frac{f_{k_1}(z_i)^N}{z_i^M} \left(\frac{M}{N}\right)^M \left(\frac{\nu}{\mu_1}\right)^{\mu_1} \left(\frac{N-\nu}{\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2}\right)^{\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&[x_1^{\mu_1}] f_{k_1}(x_1)^\nu \, [x^{\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2}] f_{k_1}(x)^{N-\nu} \\
&\le \frac{\gamma_{k_1}^2}{\sqrt{\mu_1(\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2)}} \frac{f_{k_1}(z_i)^N}{z_i^{M+1}} \left(\frac{M}{N}\right)^{M+1} \left(\frac{\nu}{\mu_1}\right)^{\mu_1} \left(\frac{N-\nu}{\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2}\right)^{\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
&[y_2^{\mu_2}] f_{k_2}(y_2)^{N-\nu} [y^{\mu_1+\mu_{1,2}}] f_{k_2}(y)^\nu \\
&\le \frac{\gamma_{k_2}^2}{\sqrt{\mu_2(\mu_{1,2}+\mu_1)}} \frac{f_{k_2}(z_o)^N}{z_o^{M+1}} \left(\frac{M}{N}\right)^{M+1} \left(\frac{N-\nu}{\mu_2}\right)^{\mu_2} \left(\frac{\nu}{\mu_1+\mu_{1,2}}\right)^{\mu_1+\mu_{1,2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

Combining (2.11) and (2.12), we get from (2.9) and $b! \le \text{const}\, b^{1/2}(b/e)^b$ that:

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}} = O\Bigg(&\binom{N}{\nu} \left(\frac{M}{eN}\right)^{2M} \frac{f_{k_1}(z_i)^N f_{k_2}(z_o)^N}{z_i^M \, z_o^M} \\
&\times \binom{M}{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \nu^{2\mu_1+\mu_{1,2}} (N-\nu)^{\mu_{1,2}+2\mu_2} \Bigg),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

were $\binom{M}{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ stands for the trinomial coefficient.

Our next step is to add up the bounds (2.13) for all $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ meeting the constraints (2.4) and $\mu_1 + \mu_{1,2} + \mu_2 = M$. As it turns out, we will not lose anything by paying attention to a single constraint $\mu_1 \ge k_1\nu$ in (2.4). Intuitively this is because the dominant contribution to the sum comes from small ν and μ_1, in which case this constraint is most stringent among those in (2.4). So, using Chernoff's method, we introduce $u > 1$ and bound

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\mu} \text{ meets (2.4)}, \\ \mu_1+\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2=M}} \binom{M}{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \nu^{2\mu_1+\mu_{1,2}} (N-\nu)^{\mu_{1,2}+2\mu_2} \\
&\le u^{-k_1\nu} \sum_{\mu_1+\mu_{1,2}+\mu_2=M} \binom{M}{\boldsymbol{\mu}} u^{\mu_1} \nu^{2\mu_1+\mu_{1,2}} (N-\nu)^{\mu_{1,2}+2\mu_2} \\
&= u^{-k_1\nu} \big(\nu^2 u + \nu(N-\nu) + (N-\nu)^2\big)^M \\
&= \big(\nu^2 + N(N-\nu)\big)^M.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

It follows then from (2.13) and (2.2) that

$$\frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} S_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{S_{N,M}} = O\left(\binom{N}{\nu} u^{-k_1\nu}\big(1-\rho+u\rho^2\big)^M\right), \quad \rho := \frac{\nu}{N}. \tag{2.15}$$

Denoting $\sigma = M/N$, and using $\sigma > \max\{k_1, k_2\}$, the RHS of (2.15) attains its absolute minimum at

$$u_{\min} = \frac{k_1(1-\rho)}{\rho(\sigma - k_1\rho)},$$

and $u_{\min} \geq 1$ iff

$$\rho \leq \rho^* := \frac{2k_1}{k_1 + \sigma + \sqrt{(\sigma-k_1)(\sigma+3k_1)}}. \tag{2.16}$$

Recall that we consider $\rho = \nu/N \leq 1/2$. All those ρ will meet the constraint (2.16) iff $\rho^* \geq 1/2$, which is equivalent to $\sigma \leq 3k_1/2$.

So, for $\sigma \leq 3k_1/2$, from (2.2) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} S_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{S_{N,M}} &= O\left[\binom{N}{\nu} \frac{\left(\frac{\sigma-\sigma\rho}{\sigma-k_1\rho}\right)^M}{\left(\frac{k_1(1-\rho)}{\rho(\sigma-k_1\rho)}\right)^{k_1\nu}}\right] \\
&= O\big(\nu^{-1/2}\, e^{NH(\rho,\sigma)}\big), \\
H(\rho,\sigma) &:= \rho\log\frac{1}{\rho} + (1-\rho)\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} + \sigma\log\left(\tfrac{\sigma-\sigma\rho}{\sigma-k_1\rho}\right) \\
&\quad - k_1\rho\log\left(\frac{k_1(1-\rho)}{\rho(\sigma-k_1\rho)}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

Since $\sigma > k_1$, we have

$$\frac{\partial H(\rho,\sigma)}{\partial\sigma} = \log\frac{\sigma-\sigma\rho}{\sigma-k_1\rho} < 0, \quad \big(\rho \in (0,1]\big).$$

So, for all $\rho \in (0, 1/2]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
H(\rho,\sigma) < H(\rho,k_1) &= (1-\rho)\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} - (k_1-1)\rho\log\frac{1}{\rho} \\
&\leq (1-\rho)\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} - \rho\log\frac{1}{\rho} \leq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

for all $\rho \in (0, 1/2]$, whence for $\rho \in \big(0, \min\{\rho^*, 1/2\}\big)$.

Let $\sigma > 3k_1/2$, so that $\rho^* < 1/2$. In this case the bound (2.17) continues to hold for $\rho \in (0, \rho^*]$. However, for $\rho \in [\rho^*, 1/2]$ the RHS of (2.14) attains its minimum at $u_{\min} = 1$, and, instead of the bound (2.17), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} S_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{S_{N,M}} &= O\left[\binom{N}{\nu}(1-\rho+\rho^2)^M\right] \\
&= O\big(\nu^{-1/2} e^{NK(\rho,\sigma)}\big), \\
K(\rho,\sigma) &:= \rho\log\frac{1}{\rho} + (1-\rho)\log\frac{1}{1-\rho} + \sigma\log(1-\rho+\rho^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

Observe that

$$\frac{\partial^2 K(\rho,\sigma)}{\partial\rho^2} = -\frac{1}{\rho(1-\rho)} + \sigma\frac{1+2\rho(1-\rho)}{\big(1-\rho(1-\rho)\big)^2} \tag{2.20}$$

is increasing on $(0,1/2]$ as $\rho(1-\rho)$ is increasing. Therefore, as a function of ρ, $K(\rho,\sigma)$ is convex on $[\rho^*,1/2]$ iff $\frac{\partial^2 K(\rho,\sigma)}{\partial\rho^2} \ge 0$ at ρ^*, or equivalently, by (2.20), iff

$$\rho^*(1-\rho^*) \ge \frac{2}{\sigma+2+\sqrt{\sigma^2+12\sigma}}.$$

From the definition of ρ^* in (2.14) it follows that, as a function of k_1, ρ^* is increasing as long as $\rho^* \le 1/2$. So the condition above holds for all $k_1 \in [2, 2\sigma/3]$, if it does for $k_1 = 2$, in which case $\sigma \ge 3$. An elementary algebraic verification does the job.

Now $\frac{\partial K(\rho,\sigma)}{\partial\rho} = 0$ at $\rho = 1/2$; so $K(\rho,\sigma)$, the convex function on $[\rho^*,1/2]$, attains its minimum at $\rho = 1/2$. Therefore $K(\rho,\sigma)$ attains its maximum at the other end ρ^*, and by definition of ρ^*,

$$K(\rho^*,\sigma) = H(\rho^*,\sigma) < 0.$$

Combining (2.17), (2.18), (2.19) and the last inequality, we conclude that $S_{N,M}^{-1}\sum_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} S_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is uniformly exponentially small for all $\nu/N = \rho \in [\varepsilon, 1/2]$, $\varepsilon > 0$ being arbitrarily small, and for $\rho < \varepsilon$

$$\frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} S_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{S_{N,M}} = O\big[\nu^{-1/2}\exp(-N(k_1-1)(\rho\log 1/\rho + O(\rho)))\big].$$

So

$$\sum_{\nu=2}^{N/2}\frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} S_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{S_{N,M}} = O(N^{-2(k_1-1)}). \tag{2.21}$$

Likewise the expected number of sink sets of size in $[2, N/2]$ is $O(N^{-2(k_2-1)})$. We conclude that the uniformly random (k_1,k_2)-core is strongly connected with probability $1 - O\big(N^{-2(k-1)}\big)$, $k := \min\{k_1,k_2\}$.

Let us show that in fact the random core is k-strongly connected with probability $1 - O\big(N^{-(k-1)}\big)$. That is, we want to show that for $t \in [1, k-1]$ w.h.p. there does not exist a partition $[N] = A_1 \uplus A_2 \uplus A_3$, with $|A_1| = \nu_1 \in [2, (N-t)/2]$, $|A_2| = \nu_2$, and $|A_3| = \nu_3 = t$ such that deletion of A_3 results in a digraph where A_1 is a source (sink) set. To do so we need to prove that the total number of sequences inducing such a partition of $[N]$ is $o(S_{N,M})$ as $N \to \infty$. The argument is a natural extension of the proof of strong connectedness. So we will focus on the new details.

Introduce μ_j, $1 \le j \le 3$, the (generic) numbers of edges in the vertex sets A_j, and $\mu_{i,j}$, the number of edges from the A_i to the A_j. For A_1 to be a source set upon deletion of A_3 we must have $\mu_{2,1} = 0$, and

$$\mu_1 + \mu_{3,1} \ge k_1\nu_1,$$

besides all other constraints, similar to those in (2.4). Define $\mu_{i,i} = \mu_i$, and

$$\mu_{\cdot,j} = \sum_i \mu_{i,j}, \quad \mu_{j,\cdot} = \sum_i \mu_{j,i},$$

Let $S_{\boldsymbol{\nu},\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ be the total number of the sequences with these parameters. Analogously to (2.5),

$$S_{\boldsymbol{\nu},\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \binom{N}{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\binom{M}{\boldsymbol{\mu}}\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{\nu},\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \quad \binom{N}{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = \frac{N!}{\nu_1!\nu_2!\nu_3!}. \tag{2.22}$$

Here $\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{\nu},\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is defined like $\mathcal{S}_{\nu,\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, with $[N]$ partitioned in three consecutive blocks A_1, A_2, A_3 of length ν_1, ν_2, and $\nu_3 = t$. Analogously to (2.8), we have

$$\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{\nu},\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \prod_{j=1}^3 \mu_{j,\cdot}!\,\mu_{\cdot,j}! \times \big[\xi_j^{\mu_{\cdot,j}}\big] f_{k_1}(\xi_j)^{\nu_j}\,\big[\eta_j^{\mu_{j,\cdot}}\big] f_{k_2}(\eta_j)^{\nu_j}.$$

Here, like (2.11)-(2.12),

$$\prod_{j=1}^3 \big[\xi_j^{\mu_{\cdot,j}}\big] f_{k_1}(\xi_j)^{\nu_j} \le \gamma_{k_1}^3 \frac{f_{k_1}(z_i)^N}{z_i^{M+3/2}} \left(\frac{M}{N}\right)^{M+3/2} \prod_{j=1}^3 \mu_{\cdot,j}^{-1/2} \left(\frac{\nu_j}{\mu_{\cdot,j}}\right)^{\mu_{\cdot,j}},$$

$$\prod_{j=1}^3 \big[\eta_j^{\mu_{j,\cdot}}\big] f_{k_2}(\eta_j)^{\nu_j} \le \gamma_{k_2}^3 \frac{f_{k_2}(z_o)^N}{z_o^{M+3/2}} \left(\frac{M}{N}\right)^{M+3/2} \prod_{j=1}^3 \mu_{j,\cdot}^{-1/2} \left(\frac{\nu_j}{\mu_{j,\cdot}}\right)^{\mu_{j,\cdot}}.$$

Consequently

$$\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{\nu},\boldsymbol{\mu}} = O\left(\frac{f_{k_1}(z_i)^N f_{k_2}(z_o)^N}{z_i^M z_o^M} \left(\frac{M}{eN}\right)^{2M} \prod_{j=1}^3 \nu_j^{\mu_{j,\cdot}+\mu_{\cdot,j}}\right).$$

This bound, combined with (2.22), (2.2) and $\sum_j(\mu_{j,\cdot}+\mu_{\cdot,j}) = 2M$, delivers

$$\frac{S_{\boldsymbol{\nu},\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{S_{N,M}} = O\left(\binom{N}{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\binom{M}{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \prod_{j=1}^3 \big(\tfrac{\nu_j}{N}\big)^{\mu_{j,\cdot}+\mu_{\cdot,j}}\right). \tag{2.23}$$

Next, analogously to the case $\nu_3 = t = 0$, we have: for $u \ge 1$ *and* $u = O(N/\nu_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|=M,\\ \mu_{2,1}=0,\,\mu_1+\mu_{3,1}\ge k_1\nu_1}} \binom{M}{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \prod_{j=1}^3 \big(\tfrac{\nu_j}{N}\big)^{\mu_{j,\cdot}+\mu_{\cdot,j}} \\
&\le u^{-k_1\nu_1} \sum_{\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|=M} u^{\mu_1+\mu_{3,1}} \binom{M}{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \prod_{j=1}^3 \big(\tfrac{\nu_j}{N}\big)^{\mu_{j,\cdot}+\mu_{\cdot,j}} \\
&= O\left[u^{-k_1\nu_1}\left(u\frac{\nu_1(\nu_1+\nu_3)}{N^2} + \frac{\nu_2+\nu_3}{N}\right)^M\right] \\
&= O\left(u^{-k_1\nu_1}(1-\rho+u\rho^2)^M\right), \quad \rho := \frac{\nu_1}{N}.
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} S_{\boldsymbol{\nu},\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{S_{N,M}} &= O\left(\binom{N}{\boldsymbol{\nu}} u^{-k_1\nu_1}(1-\rho+u\rho^2)^M\right)\\ &= O\left(N^t\binom{N-t}{\nu_1} u^{-k_1\nu_1}(1-\rho+u\rho^2)^M\right).\end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

From this moment on we reason almost like in the argument following (2.15), and end up with

$$\sum_{\nu=2}^{(N-t)/2} \min_{u\ge 1} \frac{\sum_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} S_{\boldsymbol{\nu},\boldsymbol{\mu}}}{S_{N,M}} = O\big(N^t\cdot N^{-2(k_1-1)}\big) = O\big(N^{-(k_1-1)}\big).$$

So, for $t < k_1$ ($t < k_2$ resp.), with probability $1 - O\big(N^{-(k_1-1)}\big)$ ($1 - O\big(N^{-(k_2-1)}\big)$ resp.) there is no set A of cardinality in $[2, (N-t)/2]$ which becomes a source set (sink set resp.) upon deletion of t vertices from $[N]\setminus A$.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete.

Acknowledgment. I am grateful to Dan Poole for formulating succinctly his thought-provoking conjecture and stopping me from pursuing false leads.

References

[1] J. Aronson, A. Frieze and B. Pittel, *Maximum matchings in sparse graphs: Karp-Sipser revisited*, Random Struct Algorithms **12** (1998) 111–177.

[2] V. Chvátal, *Almost all graphs with* 1.44n *edges are* 3*-colorable*, Random Struct Algorithms **2** (1991) 11–28.

[3] C. Cooper and A. Frieze. *The size of the largest strongly connected component of a random digraph with a given degree sequence*, Combin Probab Comput **13** (2004) 319–337.

[4] R. M. Karp, *The transitive closure of a random digraph*, Random Struct Algorithms **1** (1990) 73–93.

[5] R. M. Karp and M. Sipser, *Maximum matchings in sparse random graphs*, In Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computing, IEEE (1981) 364–375.

[6] T. Łuczak, *Size and connectivity of the k-core of a random graph*, Discrete Math **91** (1991) 61–68.

[7] T. Łuczak, *The phase transition in the evolution of random digraphs*, J Graph Theory **14** (1990) 217–223.

[8] T. Łuczak and T. Seierstad, *The critical behavior of random digraphs*, Random Struct Algorithms **35** (2009) 271–293.

[9] M. Molloy and B. A. Reed, *A critical point for random graphs with a given degree sequence*, Random Struct Algorithms **6** (1995)161–180.

[10] M. Molloy and B. A. Reed, *The size of the largest component of a random graph on a fixed degree sequence*, Combin Probab Comput **7** (1998) 295–306.

[11] X. Pérez-Giménez and N. Wormald, *Asymptotic enumeration of strongly connected digraphs by vertices and degrees*, Random Struct Algorithms **43** (2013) 80–114.

[12] B. Pittel, *Counting strongly-connected, moderately sparse directed graphs*, Random Struct Algorithms **43** (2013) 49–79.

[13] B. Pittel and D. Poole, *Asymptotic distribution of the numbers of vertices and arcs of the giant strong component in sparse random digraphs*, Random Struct Algorithms **49** (2016) 3-64.
[14] B. Pittel and D. Poole, Birth of a giant (k_1, k_2)-core in the random digraph. Available at arXiv:1608.05095v1
[15] B. Pittel, J. Spencer and N. Wormald, *Sudden emergence of a giant k-core in a random graph*, J Combin Theory Ser B **67** (1996) 111–151.
[16] B. Pittel and N. C. Wormald, *Counting connected graphs inside-out*, J Combin Theory Ser B **93** (2005) 122–172.

Department of Mathematics, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210-1175 (USA)
E-mail address: bgp@math.osu.edu